Page 1 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF ALASKA AT ANCHORAGE 2 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA for the use of NORTH STAR TERMINAL & 3 STEVEDORE COMPANY, d/b/a NORTHERN STEVEDORING & HANDLING, and NORTH 4 STAR TERMINAL & STEVEDORE COMPANY, d/b/a Northern Stevedoring & 5 Handling, on its own behalf, 6 Plaintiffs, 7 and 8 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA for the use of SHORESIDE PETROLEUM, INC., 9 d/b/a Marathon Fuel Service, and SHORE PETROLEUM, INC., d/b/a 10 Marathon Fuel Service, on its own behalf, 11 Intervening Plaintiffs, 12 13 and 14 METCO, INC., 15 Intervening Plaintiff, 16 NUGGET CONSTRUCTION, INC.; SPENCER 17 ROCK PRODUCTS, INC.; UNITED STATES FIDELITY AND GUARANTY 18 COMPANY; and ROBERT A. LAPORE, 19 Defendants. 20 No. A98-009 CIV (HRH) 21 DEPOSITION OF JEFFREY "JEFF" BENTZ Pages 1 - 221 (inclusive) 22 November 21, 2005 23 8:33 a.m. 24 25

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

3

4 5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18 19

20

21

22

25

1

4

5

6

7

8

25

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

22

25

Page 80

Page 78 rocket science.

A Do we solicit our customers to grant 2 3 them credit?

Q Well, yes. I mean, do you say, okay, our company has lines of credit which we can grant to a business?

- A We don't grant lines of credit.
- Do you solicit them? Q
- We don't solicit lines of credit.
- 9 10 O Okay. Then, do potential customers reveal to you that they might have a financial 11 difficulty in working with North Star and do 12 they, these potential customers, ask North Star, 13 do you have any way of assisting us so that we 14 can consummate this agreement to work with North 15 15 Star? 16

MR. SEWRIGHT: Objection to form of the 17 17 18 question.

A That's not our general way of doing 19 business as you have posed the question. 20 BY MS. HO: 21

O Then how does North Star generally do 22 this business regarding its commercial accounts 23 and credit applications? 24

A Most of our customers have been

that Mr. Bentz is reading what I am.

Q Mr. Bentz, paragraph 3, would you please read that aloud for the record?

A Well, I don't have my reading glasses with me and this is fairly illegible. But, "Applicant agrees to notify North Star Terminal & Stevedore Company promptly of any changes in ownership of the business conducted under the account name and agrees to liability for all charges to the business conducted under the account name unless and until North Star Terminal reviews written notice of a change in ownership of that business."

O And then it looks like Mr. LaPore has signed that agreement. Was there any dispute by North Star that this particular agreement signed by Mr. LaPore was unacceptable to North Star?

A Not that I know of.

Q Now, during the time that Mr. LaPore and Spencer Rocks had a business engagement with North Star, did Mr. LaPore or anyone at Spencer Rocks notify North Star that there was an ownership of business?

MR. SEWRIGHT: Object to the form of the question.

long-time customers of North Star. When we come 1 across a new business, depending on the volume of business, the length and duration of the 3

4 business, the type of business, whether or not

it's a federally-funded project, a bondable 5

project, not bonded project, we may or may not do 6 any number of variety of different ways to try to 7 8 secure our future.

O Thank you, Mr. Bentz. That's what I needed clarification on.

If you would please turn to page 4 of this nine-page document. It says Agreement on top. And it looks to be Spencer Rock Products and a signature of what looks to be Robert LaPore and what looks to be dated January 28th, 1997.

Do you disagree with what's stated on this agreement?

A Do I disagree with what's stated on the 19 agreement?

20 O In terms of what I've just noted. The 21 company name, the signature and the date.

A Yes, that's right.

MR. SEWRIGHT: Objection. Counsel, the 23 23 24 document speaks for itself.

MS. HO: Well, I just want to be sure

BY MS. HO:

Q Mr. Bentz?

A Did anybody notify us of ownership of Spencer?

Q No. Did anyone -- first, did Mr. LaPore notify you --

A Hold on just a second. Could you reread the question back to me that she asked?

(Question read by the reporter.) BY MS. HO:

Q Let me rephrase that.

Doesn't make any sense.

O The question is: First, did Mr. LaPore at any time notify North Star that Spencer Rocks Incorporated had a change of ownership in terms of its business?

Define "change in ownership." Α

Q Well, you tell me. When North Star became doing business as a limited liability company, didn't it have to go through legal steps to make sure that the form of the entity was --

A There are some customers, some people that we had contracts with that we had to notify. We didn't have to notify a lot of people.

Q Right. And in this case with Spencer

21 (Pages 78 to 81)

Page 81

Case 3:98-cv-00009-TMB

Jeffery Bentz Page 132 Page 130 to be rather confusing, I guess, to some agree. contract as a prime contractor, say, with the 1 O Well, if it was confusing, didn't North 2 federal government? 2 Star at least inquire and clarify the confusion A I don't think as a prime contractor, 3 3 no. It depends on what you're talking about. We for itself at least for purposes of the project? 4 A What confusion are you referring to? do work for the military where it's a sole-source 5 5 Well, you're the one who said contract, but not where we have necessarily subs 6 6 7 confusion. You tell me. working underneath us or anything like that. 7 8 A Tell you about the confusion? O But North Star has had dealings with 8 9 Q Yes. the federal government and how those contracts 9 10 A Well, I mean, originally the job was 10 work, correct? set up -- apparently was set up from Spencer, but A Yeah. Usually we're somewhere down the 1 11 it appears that we were taking direction from line, though, as a subcontractor or something of 12 12 what we thought was a Nugget employee at the 13 13 that nature. time, and as it turned out, it appears that he 14 14 Q Does North Star inquire -- say, for was employed by several people. 15 15 example, if North Star considers itself a supplier to a supplier on a federal bonded O It appears, but at the same time did 16 you actively inquire of the role of the contract, is North Star's normal business custom 17 17 individuals you're referring to? 18 and practice to inquire of the first tier 18 supplier what their role and position would be? 19 A I did not actively inquire. 19 20 Q And did anybody at North Star? MR. SEWRIGHT: Object to the form of 20 21 A I don't know. 21 the question. 22 So there's no representation by Nugget 22 A Give me an example. that any of its employees were taking control of 23 23 BY MS. HO: the operations of Spencer Rock. 24 Q Well, for example, in this case. Did 24 A Is that a statement? North Star actively inquire of Spencer Rock what 25 Page 133 Page 131 MR. SEWRIGHT: Objection to the form of 1 its role would be in the project? A We did not -- I don't know what all we 2 the question. 2 3 BY MS. HO: inquired on at the time that the job was set up. 3 Q I'm asking you. 4 4 O So you don't know, but who in North Star would know? 5 You didn't ask me a question. 5 Q Well, then let me ask you: To your 6 6 A Who would remember? knowledge do you know if Nugget Construction 7 7 O Who would recall, or who do you think 8 Company or any of its representatives or 8 would recall? 9 employees made representations to anyone at North 9 A I don't know. Would Jack Goodwill? Star that it was taking control of the operation? 10 10 0 Through their actions they did. A He may recall. I don't know. You'd 11 11 There was no oral representation, was 12 Q 12 have to ask him. Q I probably will. But to your 13 there? 13 recollection, you never inquired of Spencer Rock 14 A Certainly there was. 14 what their role in the Homer Spit project was? Q There was -- can you specify them? 15 15 MR. SEWRIGHT: There's Jack Goodwill's A I don't remember what all inquiries 16 16 affidavit and everything. that I had in '97. 17 17 MS. HO: No, I'm talking about --Q But to your understanding, Spencer Rock 18 18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Products was a separate and distinct company from

Q Well, what information did you have

A Back then we had the information that's

been presented to you. But, you know, it seemed

Nugget Construction Company, correct?

A I don't know that.

from Spencer Rock?

MR. SEWRIGHT: Are you talking about

him personally or representations made to North

Q No, this is on your knowledge, Mr.

Bentz, and North Star's knowledge to provide

19

20

21

22

23

24

Star?

BY MS. HO:

specific --

7

10

11

13

16

17

18

19

20

24

25

5

11

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Page 136

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

13

15

16

21

23

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

Page 134

MR. SEWRIGHT: Okay. Objection; compound question. Which one do you want? BY MS. HO:

O Well, let's go through both.

First, let's talk about North Star's understanding and belief of which individuals within Nugget Construction Company represented to North Star that they were taking control of the operations or alleged control.

A It appeared that way through their actions by the fact that Mr. LaPore was not making contact with Jack to schedule and do the 12 work and discuss the work with him; it was Randy Randolph. And at the time Randy Randolph was presenting himself as a Nugget employee --

O But the barge loadings --

A -- is what the business cards indicate. 17 18 I believe.

Q And it also indicated that Mr. Randolph 19 20 was an LDR Engineering employee.

A Well, we don't know when that timecard 22 was -- or when that name card was actually received, do we?

Q Well, that's why I'm asking you. They 24 25 were produced from your files. I want to know if

A What do you mean did we have an 1 2

exclusive --

Q Well, when North Star loads these 3 barges, the original agreement was with Spencer 4 5 Rock, correct?

A That's correct.

Q And then there was no subsequent agreement to modify that relationship between Spencer Rock and North Star, correct?

MR. SEWRIGHT: Objection to the form of the question; calls for a legal conclusion.

12 BY MS. HO:

> Q To your understanding of the facts of this case, was there any communications written or oral that would have altered that relationship between Spencer Rock and North Star?

> > MR. SEWRIGHT: Same objections.

A If you read all the documents, it appears that way. BY MS. HO:

Q That no written or oral communications 21 22 or documentation changed the relationship between Spencer Rock and North Star? 23

MR. SEWRIGHT: Continuing objection.

A Well, I think that the relationship

you know what time period they were produced.

A Everything that I've read in the case, which a lot of what I understand is from reading the documents, just like a lot of what you understand is from reading the documents because I was not in Seward at the time.

O Well, Mr. Bentz, I appreciate your understanding, but please don't impose your understanding of what I understand in the case.

A I would never do that.

Thank you. Now, in terms of what Nugget Construction employees or representatives allegedly indicated to North Star's personnel, do you have a specific communication, a specific time frame that you're referring to that would substantiate this alleged conduct?

A I believe if you look in Mr. Goodwill's document where -- under his statement it says that the loading was directed by Randy Randolph.

19 O Now, did North Star have an exclusive 20 21 agreement with Nugget to load the barges?

MR. SEWRIGHT: Object to the form of 22 23 the question.

24 BY MS. HO:

25 Q They didn't, did they?

changed as a function of -- if you read the entire story, if you read the whole novel, 2

3 instead of one chapter, to me it seems rather 4 obvious what happened.

BY MS. HO:

O I'm not asking for the whole chapter. 6 We're talking about a specific time frame, 1997 7 8 when Mr. LaPore and Spencer Rock entered an agreement with North Star. 9 10

Do you disagree with that event occurring?

12 A Disagree with what event occurring? 13 They contracted us to do work.

> Q Right.

A Uh-huh, Mr. LaPore did contract us to do some work.

Q Right. And then there's no subsequent agreement or alteration between North Star or Spencer Rock that changed that relationship?

MR. SEWRIGHT: Same continuing objections.

22 BY MS. HO:

Q Is that correct, Mr. Bentz? 23

A No, I don't agree with what you're 24 saying, the way you're wording it.

Page 140 Page 138 particular paragraph? 1 Q Well, then can you point to any 1 MS. HO: Yes, paragraph 10. particular document or communications that would 2 MR. SEWRIGHT: Thank you. show that that relationship between North Star 3 BY MS. HO: and Spencer Rock changed? 4 5 Q Now, after reading that --5 A Yeah. MR. SEWRIGHT: Have you had a chance to 6 Q Okay. Go ahead. 6 7 A Jack's affidavit, for one, says that look at all of paragraph 10? 7 THE WITNESS: No, no. Randy Randolph was the one directing him. If you 8 8 go and you read in the testimony of all this, it 9 BY MS. HO: says that Bob LaPore ended up driving a truck and 10 Q Go ahead and look at that. Just that 10 that he wasn't actually doing what he was hired 11 last sentence. 11 to do. If you read it, it says that there was a 12 A What? Nugget was calling the shots? Q No, that's a complete support agreement in place that we were never 13 13 mischaracterization of Mr. Goodwill's affidavit. 14 14 informed of. 15 I'm asking you to read the last --15 Q Never informed of the support MR. SEWRIGHT: Objection, Counsel. I'm 16 agreement. When was the first time you had 16 going to read from this affidavit, top of page 6, knowledge of the support agreement? 17 17 18 "Which also demonstrates to me that Nugget was A After all the work had been done. 18 19 And did you expect that those kind of calling the shots." Now, how is that a 19 O mischaracterization of the exhibit? 20 agreements that were privy between my client, 20 MS. HO: Counsel, I'm asking Mr. Bentz 21 Nugget Construction Company, and Spencer Rocks 21 to read paragraph 10 on page 5. would have been shown to the world? 22 22 Q Why are you on paragraph 6, sir? 23 MR. SEWRIGHT: Objection to the form of 23 24 A It's not. It's page 6; it's still the question, Counsel. 24 paragraph 10, the end of paragraph 10. 25 A No, what I would expect is that if I Page 141 Page 139 received money from somebody that wasn't mine, it 1 Q The sentence before that. I already stated for the record starting with the word belonged to somebody else because they performed 2 "when." 3 the work, that I'd make sure they got the money 3 for it. That's what I would expect. 4 A Do you want me to comment on one 4 5 sentence? 5 BY MS. HO: Q And that enforcement of your monies due 6 Q I will ask -- and if you read it for 6 the record, please. "When I" -- or if you want, should have been between North Star and Spencer 7 Rock because that was the agreement between the 8 I'm happy to read it for the record. Whichever 8 9 way you want. 9 two entities, correct? 10 10 A I disagree with you wholeheartedly. A Go ahead. Q Okay. "When I" -- meaning Jack 11 Q I disagree with you, too, sir. 11 12 Goodwill -- "demanded payment from Nugget through A That's your prerogative. We disagree 12 Randy Randolph, Mr. Randolph told me that Nugget 13 with each other, Mrs. Ho. 13 believed Spencer Rock owed Northern Stevedoring 14 MR. SEWRIGHT: Since we've established 14 15 the money and that, as far as he was concerned, 15 we disagree, can we just end right now? payment was a matter between Spencer Rock and BY MS. HO: 16 16 Northern Stevedoring."

O Let's not do that. Let's turn to

Exhibit 7, which is Mr. Jack Goodwill's

10, last sentence starting with --

Q Read that to yourself.

A Page 5, you said?

Q Page 5, yes.

A Okay.

affidavit, and then you look at page 5, paragraph

MR. SEWRIGHT: Did you point out a

17

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

He said it was not Nugget's problem.

A In his opinion.

Q Do you disagree with that?

can't disagree with his opinion; it's his

Well, then your opinion is, essentially, that you think my clients are owing

A Do I disagree with his opinion? I

17 18

19

20

21

22

23.

24

25

opinion.

Case No. A98-009 Civil (HRH) Page 142 Page 144 you monies, right? at the whole exhibit, which consists of five 2 A Absolutely. 2 pages. Is that what you have, Mr. Bentz? 3 Q Well, that's absolutely incorrect 3 A Yeah, five pages. 4 because at any time to North Star's knowledge --4 Q Okay. Great. Now, this is Exhibit No. 5 MR. SEWRIGHT: Counsel, will you ask 5 11, which contains the material contract between questions and not argue your case? If you want Spencer Rock Products and Nugget Construction 6 to argue your case, do it in front of the judge Company and also the subsequent support agreement 7 between Nugget Construction Company and Spencer 8 and the jury. Don't argue with the witness, who 8 9 9 Rock Products dated April 23rd, 1997. is my client. 10 BY MS. HO: 10 Do you disagree with that? Q Okay, Mr. Bentz. I don't want to argue 11 A I haven't finished reading it yet. 11 12 MR. SEWRIGHT: Counsel, for the record, 12 with you, but to your knowledge was there any time that my client, Nugget Construction Company .13 let's establish these documents are really two 14 orally or writtenly (ph) said that it was ever separate documents; the four-page what is going to assume Mr. LaPore's responsibilities in 15 entitled Material Contract dated on or about the 15 its agreement with -middle of January, 1997; and then a subsequent 16 support agreement, a separate document, dated 17 A Absolutely. 17 18 Q Okay. Cite that time, sir. 18 April 23, a one-pager. I mean, because you have them stapled together as one exhibit, I wanted to A When they entered into the support 19 19 agreement without our knowledge and went in and 20 point out they're separate documents. 20 MS. HO: I'll identify them as Nugget 21 took over the quarry. 21 22 Q They went in with a support agreement; 007224 through Nugget 00728. 23 MR. SHAMBUREK: Would it help to mark 23 that has nothing to do with North Star. That agreement was with Spencer Rock and with Nugget 24 the Support Agreement as Exhibit 12? 24 Construction Company. MR. SEWRIGHT: I think so. 25 Page 143 Page 145 1 MR. SEWRIGHT: Objection. 1 MS. HO: Let's go ahead and do that. 2 That's fine. 2 A Ms. Ho, they stepped into the shoes of 3 (Exhibit 12 marked.) 3 the client that we were supposed to be working 4 for and they directed us to do the work. They 4 BY MS. HO: then collected the money, intercepted the money 5 Q Now, Mr. Bentz, you've reviewed 5 Defendants' Exhibit No. 11 and Defendants' 6 that never got paid to the person that we were 6 7 Exhibit No. 12, have you not? 7 supposed to work for so that we could get our 8 A I've read 11, yeah. 8 money. 9 9 BY MS. HO: Q Okay. And Exhibit 11 is the Material Contract between Nugget Construction Company and 10 Q Mr. Bentz, those are serious Spencer Rock Products; is that correct? allegations against my client. If you have any 11 11 particular knowledge or fact of a specific 12 A That's what it says. 12 Q Okay. If you turn to page 2 of Exhibit 13 13 incident that shows that, please cite that. 14 Now, Mr. Bentz, I will submit to you No. 11 and go to Section No. 4 on the bottom of the support agreement as between my client and 15 the page --15 16 A Yeah. 16 Spencer Rock and Robert LaPore. 17 Would you please mark this as an 17 Q -- you can read that paragraph to 18 exhibit? 18 yourself, and it runs over to the next page, A Are we done with Exhibit 10 for now? Nugget 007226. 19 19 20 MR. SEWRIGHT: Section what? O For now. 20 21 (Exhibit 11 marked.) 21 MS. HO: Section 5. Section 5 runs at

the end of the second page and goes into the top

MR. SEWRIGHT: Which one do you want

THE WITNESS: Okay.

of the third page.

24

25

MR. SEWRIGHT: Do you want him to look

at the whole exhibit or just the last page?

Q While you're at it, why don't you look

22

23

24

25

BY MS. HO:

3

4

5

6

7

10

11

12

17

18

19

23

24

3

4

5

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

Page 152

Page 150

objection is noted for the record.

THE WITNESS: Just hold on a second. Could you please reread her question as she stated it?

> (Question read back by the reporter.) MR. SEWRIGHT: Same objections.

A I'm not sure how to answer your question.

BY MS. HO:

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

21

1 2

3

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

19

20

21

Q Okay. Let me break it down for you. In North Star's understanding, there was North Star and Spencer Rock which had the business relations, is that correct, in 1997 that North Star provide stevedoring job duties on the project for Spencer Rock; is that correct?

MR. SEWRIGHT: Continuing objection tol6 the form of the question; legal conclusion.

A We were originally contacted by 19 Mr. LaPore to load rock onto a barge pending their successful outcome at getting the work, was 20 20 how it was originally parlayed to me. That's my understanding of how the whole situation started 22

23 BY MS. HO:

24 Q Okay. 25 A You know, but whether or not Spencer have paid the people that they have to pay.

Q And that's what Nugget Construction Company has done. Your counsel has revealed all the documents on vendors and subcontractors and whatnot on this particular project.

But with respect between North Star and Spencer Rock and the business arrangement there, it was Spencer Rock who was responsible for ultimately paying for North Star's services.

A Originally that's what we thought, but there's, you know, after we'd done the work, we learned of all these other things that indicate that in fact we weren't really even working for Spencer Rock. We were working for Nugget.

Q But there's no oral or written communications in effect that would indicate that, sir.

A I think there are plenty of facts here to indicate that.

Q You're being ambiguous. I don't know what facts you're referring to.

MR. SEWRIGHT: Counsel, I'm really, I'm really -- in the jurisdiction you just don't make those kind of statements and argue with a witness at a deposition. I'm really starting -- I'm not

did something negligent or not, which would lead 1 to clause 10 being held -- you know...

Q I just want to show you now that you have a chance to look -- you're saying that my clients didn't disclose this contract to you and whatnot. There are terms and conditions that are specific between the parties who are engaged in the agreement just like North Star has certain obligations and duties under its contract with its vendors or suppliers; isn't that correct?

A Yes.

MR. SEWRIGHT: I'm going to object to the form of the question.

You can go ahead and try to answer. I'm just objecting for the record.

A If I receive money for services that I provided because of a subcontract and somebody actually produced that work so that I could get that money for that, I'd make sure they got paid for their services. That's their money. BY MS. HO:

22 O But then ---

23 A It's a federal job. The reason there's bonding on federal jobs is so the federal 24 government ensures that their general contractor\$ 25 going to get upset -- but I'm pointing out to you

that that's unusual, so...

MS. HO: Counsel, I appreciate your objection.

MR. SEWRIGHT: And I'm going to have continuing objection to your argumentative questions, your assuming facts not in evidence, your speeches, et cetera. And just because you end your speech with an "isn't that correct," doesn't turn it into a question and it doesn't turn it into a proper question. So I will continue to object. I have a continuing line of objections to these types of questions.

MS. HO: Counsel, I appreciate your objections. They're noted for the record. I have not been discourteous to your client. We're just trying to ascertain the validity of the claims and the allegations.

MR. SEWRIGHT: I didn't claim you were being discourteous.

MS. HO: I'm not being argumentative. MR. SEWRIGHT: That I do claim.

23 BY MS. HO:

> Q Mr. Bentz, if North Star is a party to this litigation, then my clients are entitled to

> > 39 (Pages 150 to 153)

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

12

13

14

15

3

4

5

10

11

12

13

14

17

18

19

20

21

22

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

18

20

22

23

25

Page 166

Q You cannot pinpoint any specific communication that would indicate Nugget directed --

A Other than what's on record already, I don't know of anything else.

O Okay. So in North Star's beliefs and your beliefs, for that matter, when did Nugget start directing the activities of the barge -- do you consider it after the first barge loading by North Star?

A You already asked that question. I've answered it twice. Starting with the first barge.

Q Okay. Now, if that's the case then, 15 was there any indication by North Star that in its minds and its belief that Nugget had taken over the agreement between Spencer and North Star?

> Through their actions. Α

Well, what actions are you referring Q to?

The fact that an employee that's 23 supposedly a Nugget employee, but as it turns out23 is a Spencer owner and has got his own business 24 and everything else going on, was directing us to 25 Page 168

Traeger?

MR. MACHETANZ: I'd be happy to do that.

THE WITNESS: Let's go.

MR. MACHETANZ: Do you have any objections to it, Counsel?

MR. SEWRIGHT: Let's just go off the record for a moment.

9 (Short discussion off the record.) 10

MS. HO: Let's go back on the record, then. 11

Q Now, we were talking about tonnage. 12 Do you know or does anybody at North 13 Star know who determined the number of trucks 14 that would arrive at the barge? 15

A I don't know.

O Who would know at North Star?

A Probably Spencer and Nugget would know how many trucks were arriving.

O Was Goodwill there? Was Goodwill present at the barges when the trucks were arriving?

A You'll have to ask him.

Q But to your knowledge you don't personally know.

Page 167

do the work.

Q Directing you to do the work. What work are you referring to? These are Nugget's barges. They had an interest in ensuring that no damage would have been done to these barges; isn't that true?

MR. SEWRIGHT: Object to the form of the question; compound. You had about three or four things in there topped off with "isn't that true."

MS. HO: Thank you, Counsel. Let me rephrase.

O First of all, when Nugget was at the 13 barges and so-called what you testified as 14 directing the barge loadings, isn't it true that 15 Nugget had an interest in these barges and how 16 17 these barges were handled?

MR. SEWRIGHT: Same objection.

19 A I can't --

THE WITNESS: Traeger, do you want to switch places with her? Because if you're going 21 to be feeding her the questions, I might as well be sitting across the table from you, which I'll be more than happy to do. 24

MR. SEWRIGHT: Do you want to respond,25

Page 169

Now, when did Spencer Rock ever tell 1 Nugget to your knowledge or to anyone at North Star's knowledge that it had a contract with my 3 4 client, Nugget Construction Company? 5

A I'm sorry?

When to your knowledge or North Star's 6 knowledge did Spencer Rock ever communicate to North Star that Nugget had a contract with North 9 Star?

10 A Did -- could you please repeat the 11 question?

MR. MACHETANZ: You used the word Spencer.

THE WITNESS: I'd like for her to repeat the question.

MR. SEWRIGHT: Object to the form. Do 16 you want to rephrase, or do you want her to read 17 18

19 (Question was read by the reporter.)

A I can't answer that. I don't know the 20 21 answer to that question.

22 BY MS. HO:

O Okay. So there was no purported 23 communication that you know of from Spencer? 24

A From Spencer to us that Nugget had a

Page 220

WITNESS CERTIFICATE

2 JEFFREY "JEFF" BENTZ Taken November 21, 2005

3 I hereby certify that I have read the foregoing

deposition and accept it as true and correct,

4 with the following exceptions:

| 6 | PAGE | LINE | CORRECTION | / | // |
|-----|----------|----------|----------------------|--------|-------------|
| 7 | 44 | <u> </u> | 1/260" Should 51 | ty AG | |
| 8 | 69 | 22_ | "IAPULE" Should SA | , , , | Jalph" |
| 9 | 101 | _// | "cuff off" should so | | OFF |
| 10 | 152 | 23_ | This Jurisdiction |) | |
| 11 | 152 | 24 | Kinds | | |
| 12 | 181 | 21 | I+ collecter | | · . |
| 1.3 | 182 | 6 | By Nugget | | |
| 14 | 185 | 13=14 | "They" me An 5. | Vugget | |
| 15 | 195 | 23 | "corp" should be | COUR | T |
| 16 | <u> </u> | · | | | |
| 17 | | | | | |

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

Date

1-10-08

JEFFREY BENTZ

(Use additional paper to note corrections as needed, signing and dating each page.) (LK)